

IN THE DRAWINGS

Figure 1 has been labeled as prior art.

Attachment: One (1) Replacement Sheet.

REMARKS

New claims 18-23 are respectfully submitted as substitutes for original claims 1-6, which have now been canceled. The claims have been amended to more clearly and fully delineate the patentable subject matter to which this application is directed, and to correct other minor errors in the original claims, including the elimination of reference numerals and the like. The claims are fully supported in the specification and no new matter is included therein. Applicant therefore respectfully requested examination of these claims on the merits, particularly in view of the fact that applicant submits that these claims now clearly define patentable subject matter with respect to the cited references. Thus, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, and in particular to Figure 1 as not designating "prior art." Attached hereto is proposed amended Figure 1 with such designation now included thereon. This clearly overcomes this objection.

The Examiner has objected to claims 4-6 under Rule 75(c). However, in view of the cancellation of these claims and the substitution of new claims 21-23 therefor, it is submitted that this objection has also been clearly obviated.

Claims 1-3 have been rejected as being anticipated by Sasaki under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). The Examiner contends that Sasaki discloses a cassette comprising first and second portions 1A and 1B which are parallel and form a space and which are joined by connecting part (not numbered), as well as bearing supports 3a and 3b, receiving portions 8 for engaging the film 12, and a gripping recess 4 for exposing the film, said to be shown in Figures 1-4. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments and arguments and for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

Sasaki is specifically directed to a cassette accommodation case for accommodating and keeping an audio compact cassette or the like therein. From the outset, it is thus clear that the subject matter of Sasaki is quite different from the subject matter of the present invention; *i.e.*, it does not at all relate to the large and cumbersome cinema film rolls which are the subject of the present invention. Beyond that, however, applicant's claims now specifically require that the first and second portions of the cassette include a circular connecting portion which essentially corresponds to the circular shape of a cinema film roll, again as contrasted to the subject matter of Sasaki. Even more particularly, however, the claims now not only require a pair of bearing supports, but they specifically require that the bearing supports extend beyond both the first portion and the contact edge of the second portion, as can be particularly seen in Figure 3 hereof.

In referring to Sasaki, the Examiner has made specific reference to Figures 1-4 thereof, and the fact that these figures disclose concave grooves 3a and 3b on the inner surface sides of the first and second halves of the cassette accommodation case thereof. These concave grooves 3a and 3b are intended to provide for swelled portions 16a and 16b of the cassette 10 as shown in Figure 1. Thus, their only function is maintained within the cassette accommodation case itself; *i.e.*, when the cassette is contained therein. They certainly do not suggest, even in the environment of Sasaki, the presence of the bearing supports of the present invention extending beyond the contact edge of the second portion, and certainly not for the specific purposes of the present invention; namely, to allow the cassettes of the present invention to rest on a substantially horizontal circular table in order to transfer a heavy and cumbersome cinema film roll between the cassette and the circular table. The bearing supports of the present invention,

extending beyond the first and second portions of the cassette itself, are thus arranged to provide weight relief against the circular table when the cinema film roll is moved therebetween. No such elements for achieving any such purpose is shown in Sasaki. Indeed, the disclosure of Sasaki further describes the concave grooves 3a and 3b as being provided symmetrically on the left and right sides of the cassette inserting direction so that a cassette then can be inserted into the cassette accommodation case irrespective of which direction it faces. This is not even related to the subject matter of the presently claimed invention.

Beyond that, it is also clear that the Sasaki reference in no way teaches a receiving portion as required by claim 19 for the purposes thereof, nor a gripping recess exposing a portion of the cinema film roll to move the film roll in and out of the cassette. In Sasaki, the two sides are symmetrical, and there is no need to provide such a mechanism since the cassette merely slides in and out of the cassette accommodation case itself. It is therefore respectfully submitted that at least these claims are fully patentable over this art.

Claims 4-6 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Sasaki in view of Roberts *et al.* under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). After admitting that the Sasaki reference does not disclose handles, concave edges or a cover, Roberts *et al.* is said to disclose a film container comprising concave edge 48, cutout handles 86 and cover 32 in Figures 1-12 thereof. The Examiner thus contends that it would be obvious to provide the cassette of Sasaki with the concave edge, handles and cover of Roberts *et al.* to hold and protect a circular film roll. This rejection is respectfully traversed in view of the above amendments and arguments and for the reasons set forth hereinafter.

Applicant initially reiterates all of the above-noted contentions with respect to the clear deficiencies of Sasaki, particularly with respect to claims 21-23. Roberts *et al.* is directed to a film transport container for transporting theatrical release prints mounted on plastic cores. It thus clearly does not even refer to the same subject matter as Sasaki, and applicant therefore respectfully disagrees with the appropriateness of combining these references in the first instance. However, even if they are combined, they certainly do not teach the subject matter which is set forth in the present claims.

The Roberts *et al.* reference nowhere suggests any mechanism for moving cinema film rolls from a substantially horizontal circular table into a cassette such as that of the present invention. Thus, while the transport containers of Roberts *et al.* may include a circular edge, and even a carrying handle, this disclosure in no way overcomes the clear deficiencies of Sasaki with respect to the basic elements of this invention, including the specifically defined first and second portions, and the specifically defined bearing members hereof. Again, there is no reference in Roberts *et al.* to the problem which is alleviated by the cassettes of the present invention, much less the specific solution of that problem which is set forth in the present claims.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the claims in this application now possess the requisite novelty, utility and unobviousness to warrant their immediate allowance, and such action is therefore respectfully solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that he telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

Application No.: 10/531,749

Docket No.: ALBIHN W 3.3-460

Finally, if there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: February 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Arnold H. Krumholz

Registration No.: 25,428

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

848246_1.DOC